UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.upub.gov.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,781	10/23/2003	Changyong Lee	4220-123 US	7161
Diane Dunn Mo	7590 11/20/200 cKav. Esq.	EXAMINER		
Mathews, Collins, Shepherd & McKay, P.A. Suite 306 100 Thanet Circle Princeton, NJ 08540			BEKKER, KELLY JO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/691,781	LEE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kelly Bekker	1794	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CO	NDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendme application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in of or Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply measurement of the condition of the compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ent, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
periods:  a)	
<ul> <li>b) The period for reply expires <u>5 months from the mailing date of the linear rejection.</u></li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the d</li> </ul>	ate out forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS fro Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b)	m the mailing date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	,
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the correspond under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period is set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ling amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.3	Of war at her filled within two wearths of the plate of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.87 Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set AMENDMENTS	1.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of fi (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search	
<ul><li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li></ul>	
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by m appeal; and/or	aterially reducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of	of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice	of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	
7.  ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: 4.	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections us showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented.	nder appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the cla	ims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the a See Continuation Sheet.	oplication in condition for allowance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(	s)
13. Other:	_
/Lien Tran/ /Kelly Bekker/	
Primary Examiner	
Art Unit 1794	

Cont. 3: The proposed amendments filed November 12, 2008 add the limitation of washing the rice with purified water prior to coating the rice with emulsified oil. As such, the amendments filed November 12, 2008, will not be entered because they raise new issues that would require further search and/or consideration. Washing of the long grain rice with purified water was not previously searched or considered.

Cont 8: The proposed affidavit has not been entered because applicant has failed to provide a good and sufficient reason why the affidavit is necessary and was not earlier presented. Furthermore, it is noted that affidavit compares the instant invention with the closest prior art of record, however, in doing such, applicant does not compare the teachings of the prior art of record that fall within applicant's claimed range; i.e. applicant claims sterilization for a cumulative time of 16-80 seconds at 130-150C; Komatsu teaches of sterilization at 130-160C for 1-80 minutes; and applicant compares the instant application at some point between 16 and 80 seconds at 130C, 140C, and 150C respectively to Komatsu at 8.4 minutes, 5.8 minutes, and 4.5 minutes, at 130C, 140C, and 150C respectively; applicant does not compare the teachings of Komatsu at 60-80 seconds. i.e. the teachings which read upon applicant's limitations.

Cont. 11: Applicant's comments filed November 12, 2008 have been considered but are not deemed persuasive. Applicant's arguments are based on a proposed amendments and affidavit that has not been entered (see above) and on arguments, specifically regarding repeated sterilization, which have been addressed in the office action mailed June 12, 2008.

Thus the rejections are maintained for the reasons of record, as set forth in the Final Office action.